

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT NO. 22 DIVISION-STREET, BY P. PRICE, AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1832.

NO. 17.

ORIGINAL.

SCRIPTURAL EXPOSITION.

By W. BALFOUR.

"For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, the Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true: wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth." Tit. i, 10—14.

The context of this passage shows the following things, which may be taken for granted. Paul wrote this to Titus, and with a special reference to the selection of persons to be Bishops, or teachers in the church. The persons thus selected, had not only the church to teach, but the times required them to be men, capable also of silencing a class of persons, who gave no small trouble to the churches, as teachers of religion among themselves. For the sake of some order in my remarks I shall,

1st. Advert to the description Paul gives of the character and conduct of such teachers. He says, that there were "many" of them; and they were specially "of the circumcision." A doubt cannot be entertained, that they were Jews, and probably were similar to those teachers referred to Acts xv, 1, 2, and so often alluded to in the Epistles to the churches. Let us 1st. notice their character. It is said they were *unruly*. The word *anipotaktos* here rendered *unruly*, signifies—not subject. It occurs Heb. ii, 8, also, Tit i, 6, where the apostle enjoins, that a man chosen to be a teacher in the church, must—"not be accused of riot or unruly." The only other place where it is found, is 1 Tim. i, 9, where it is rendered *disobedient*, and for such kind of persons, the law was made to punish them. It seems to refer to the want of subjection to the laws of God or man, by which a christian at all times ought to be governed.

2nd. Those teachers were "vain talkers." This is the only place where this word occurs. It is defined by Lexicographers to signify "a vain talker, one idly prating what is of no use." Compare 1 Tim. i, 6, Acts xiv, 15, 1 Cor. xiii, 20, and 15, 19, Tit. iii, 9, James i, 1, 26, 1 Pet. i, 18, where the word from which it is derived, and a similar word occurs. Macknight says—"Foolish talkers are persons, who utter a multitude of foolish and trifling things, on the subjects concerning which they speak."

3d. Such teachers were "deceivers." *Phrenapates* here rendered *deceivers* is from *phrenapatao*, which signifies—"to deceive, impose upon the mind or understanding." Compare Gal. vi, 3. The word occurs in no other place. Such persons no doubt deceived themselves, but the deception referred to, is, they deceived those whom they pretended to teach. How? By the multitude of foolish and trifling things which they taught them; which, probably were derived from the Jewish Talmuds and Targums. But it is of little consequence, what the foolish things are, or from what source they are derived, if teachers deceive their hearers by them. Indeed, all teaching in religion, not derived from, and supported by the scriptures, is only "vain talk-

ing;" and if it does not deceive, it is only amusing the hearers. But that man, does not deserve the name of a christian teacher, who teaches christianity as a matter of amusement, thinking if he does no good, he does very little harm to the community.

2nd. I shall now advert to the conduct of such teachers. It is described thus—"who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake." The word *Anatrepo* rendered *subvert* occurs also, 2 Tim. ii, 18. It is said, the allusion here is to persons, who overturn houses by undermining their foundation. It is rendered *Overthrow*, 2 Tim. ii, 18, and applied to the effect produced by the false doctrine of Hymeneus and Philetus; "who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." The teachers mentioned in the passage before us, *subverted*, or overturned whole houses, or families, respecting their faith in the doctrines of Christ. They did this, by "teaching things which they ought not," the foolish trifling things referred to by the apostle above. Macknight says—"The things which the false teachers, contrary to their conscience, inculcated for the sake of drawing money from the Jewish converts, were, the necessity of obeying the law of Moses in order to salvation; the efficacy of the Levitical atonements, to procure pardon for those who continued in their sins; and the merit of being descended from Abraham, whereby all his children without exception, were thought entitled to eternal life. Hence the Jews were so extremely anxious about their genealogies; hence also, the apostle in this, and in his epistles to Timothy, severely condemned genealogies, and the fables therewith connected." See Tit. 3, 9.

Whatever the things were, which these men taught, the motive which influenced them was base in the extreme. They taught them "for filthy lucre's sake." In verse 7. it is expressly required, that a bishop must not be "given to filthy lucre," and this was one thing, which distinguished true teachers from the false in the age of the apostles. They fed the flock of God, "taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind," 1 Peter v, 2, or, as the words thus rendered signify, "for the sake or love of vile gain." It is not he who desires the salary of a bishop, but he who desires the office or work of a bishop, desireth a good work. But the teachers referred to in the passage, counted gain godliness, and taught to please the people, that they might make money out of them. I shall now,

2nd. Show, that Paul's statements concerning them are confirmed by historical testimony. The passage says—"one of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, the Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies." Macknight renders this verse thus—"Cretians are always liars, evil wild beasts, lazy bellies." The term *prophet*, neither in scripture nor among the heathens, always signified one who foretold future events, but sometimes a poet or ordinary teacher. The Egyptians "called those prophets who presided over their sacred rites." The *prophet*, which is here referred to by Paul, was Epimenides, see Macknight, who says—"The Cretians were universally hated and branded as liars by the other Greeks, because, as Warbur-

ton remarks, Divine Legat. Vol. i, p. 159, by showing in their Island the tomb of Jupiter, the father of Gods and men, they published what the rest of the Greeks concealed in their mysteries; namely, that their gods were dead men. The character given of the Cretians by Epimenides was applied with propriety by the apostle to the Judaizers, because they were natives of Crete."

The person referred to—"was a prophet of their own;" and what the apostle says of the Cretians is strongly confirmed by the following quotation from Enfield's history of Philosophy, Vol. 1. p. 127, 128. "Epimenides was a Cretian, of whom many marvellous fables are related. It is said, that going, by his father's order in search of a sheep, he laid himself down in a lane, where he fell asleep, and slept for fifty years." Another idle story told of this Cretian, is, that he had a power of sending his soul out of his body, and recalling it at pleasure. It is added, that he had familiar intercourse with the gods, and possessed the power of prophecy. During a plague in Attica, the Athenians sent for him to perform a sacred lustration, in consequence of which it is said, that the gods were appeased, and the plague ceased. He is reputed to have lived, after his return to Crete, to the age of 157 years. We probably owe most of these tales to the Cretians, who were to a proverb, famous for their powers of invention. All that is credible concerning Epimenides, is, that he was a man of superior talents, who pretended to intercourse with the gods, and to support his pretensions, lived in retirement upon the spontaneous productions of the earth, and practised various arts of imposture. Perhaps, in his hours of pretended inspiration, he had the art of appearing totally insensible and entranced, which would easily be mistaken, by ignorant spectators, for a power of dismissing or recalling his spirit. Solon, in whose time the lustration above mentioned was performed, seems to have been no stranger to the true character of Epimenides; for we find, that he greatly disapproved of the conduct of the Athenians in employing him to perform this ceremony. Divine honors were paid him, after his death, by the superstitious Cretians. He has no other claim to be maintained among philosophers, except that he wrote a Theogony, and other poems concerning religious mysteries."

If the teachers, whom Paul calls "unruly, foolish talkers, and deceivers," were natives of Crete, as is affirmed in the passage, it is not improbable that they amused their hearers with such silly stories as are given in the above quotation. Paul brought against them no false accusation, for their character was famous for inventing such lies, and refers to Epimenides, a prophet of their own, in proof of the fact. The bible, then, speaks according to the truth of things, and of men's characters, neither court-ing their praise, or fearing their frown. Historical facts confirm the testimony of scripture.

But Paul adds, concerning the Cretians, that they were "evil wild beasts, lazy bellies." *Evil wild beasts*. Parkhurst says, "Paul applies to the Cretians the character of *kaka theria*, evil beasts, which the poet Epimenides had formerly given them. Such epithets to wicked, cruel, or unreasonable men, are by no means unusual in the Greek and Roman writers, as the reader may see by consulting Saucer's Thesaur. under *Tha-*

tion II. See also *Raphelius*, *Wetstein*, and *Kypke*, on Tit. 1, 12. To the passages they have produced, I add that in *Josephus* De Bel. lib. 1, cap. 39, sect. 3. Herod the Great, is called *Therion*, and *Phonikon Therion*, a murderous wild beast." *Lazy bellies*, or as Parkhurst defines it, "not at work, idle, not employed, inactive." See Matt. xx, 3, 6; 1 Tim. v, 13, 15; 2 Peter i, 8." He adds, "hence used by a figure for a person given to his belly, or gluttony." Macknight observes, "By calling the Cretians evil wild beasts, the poet insinuated, that they were of a fierce, ravenous, noxious disposition; and by adding *lazy bellies*, he signified that they were lazy gluttons; as averse to action, as wild beasts are after gorging themselves with their prey."

The apostle adds, "this witness is true." What witness is true? Evidently, the witness of Epimenides, just noticed, concerning the Cretians. If he was an impostor, if he even was a noted liar, like the rest of the Cretians, yet Paul declares, that in the character he had given them, he for once had spoken the truth. Thus the candor of an apostle bears testimony to truth, even when spoken by a heathen, for truth can never be any thing but truth, by whomsoever it may be spoken. This is a noble example for christians to follow, for they ought ever to love truth and follow truth, through evil and good report.

3d. Consider how those teachers were to be treated. It has been noticed already, that Paul was here instructing Titus, and with a special view to those teachers. He then says to him, 1st. "Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." "Wherefore rebuke them sharply," or rebuke them "severely, with severity, cutting off, or cutting as it were to the quick." See Parkhurst and Comp. 2 Cor. xiii, 10; 1 Cor. v, 1—5. Macknight remarks, "this metaphor is taken from surgeons, who, in curing their patients, are sometimes obliged to cut their flesh in such a manner as to give them great pain. Titus was to reprove the Cretians cuttingly or sharply. But the sharpness of his reproofs was not to consist in the bitterness of the language which he used, nor in the passion with which he spake. Reproofs of that sort have little influence to make one healthy, either in faith or practice. It was to consist in the strength of the reasons with which he enforced his reproofs and in the earnestness and affection with which he delivered them; whereby the conscience of the offenders being awakened, would sting them." Plutarch, perhaps, expresses the manner of administering such reproofs in the following sentence: "Fathers ought to temper the severity of reproofs with mildness." This we should think is essential, if the end proposed by Paul is intended to be accomplished. The end he proposed, is contained in the reason he assigns, why they were to be rebuked sharply, namely, "that they may be sound in the faith." The word *hygiainosin* here rendered *sound*, more properly means to be *healthful, vigorous*, and from that with which it is associated, evidently means to be healthy or vigorous in the faith, or doctrine of Christ. Their being unruly, their delighting in such foolish talking, and teaching such things to their hearers, proved that they were out of health, were sickly in the faith. None healthy in the faith could love such food, or feed others with it. "To cure them, Paul enjoined it on Titus to rebuke them sharply, to rouse them to a sense of their condition, and produce a reformation."

2d. Paul says further, "Not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men that turn from the truth." The New Testament speaks of fables in general, 1 Tim. i, 4; 2 Tim. iv, 4. Of cunningly devised fables, 2 Pet. i, 16. Of profane and old wives fables, 1 Tim. iv, 7. And in this passage of Jewish fables, Tit. i, 14.

It is thought by some, that Paul, by *Jewish fables*, refers to their mystical, cabalistical interpretations of Moses' law; and, by the commandments or precepts of men, those doctrines and commandments, by which our Lord told the Jews they had made void God's law. If by *Jewish fables*, be understood fables of Jewish invention, this no doubt is true, but if we understand fables then believed by Jews, we must include some of the heathen fables also; for after the Babylonish captivity, many of the heathen fables or opinions, were imbibed by the Jews. This is admitted by all sects of Christians, and quotations might be made from various writers in proof of it. I shall content myself with the following from Dr. Campbell's 6th Preliminary Dissertation. He says, "But the opinions neither of Hebrews, nor of heathens, remained invariably the same." And from the time of the captivity, more especially from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Romans; as they had a closer intercourse with Pagans, they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects whereon their law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom. On this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Savior's time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets. As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the departed were susceptible both of enjoyment and of suffering, they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the Pagan fables on this subject, nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner; but the general train of thinking in both, came pretty much to coincide," etc. Opinions such as these were held by the Jews in our Lord's day.

If we had a full and perfect account of the opinions of the Jews in our Lord's day, by comparing them with their scriptures, we might ascertain, with some degree of certainty, what fables and commandments had been received by them. But to obtain this, is perhaps impossible at this distance of time. Nor is it essential; for whatever they were, or from whatsoever source derived, they all go to produce this bad effect—they "turn from the truth." Or, as Macknight renders it, "who turn away the truth." Just in proportion as the fables and commandments of men are regarded, among any people, in the same proportion is the truth turned away. The past history of the world fully proves this. Men, professing themselves to be wise in religion, have always become fools. And if the account was made out, it would be found, that much more time and zeal and money have been spent by men in attending to their own fables and commandments, than in understanding the doctrines and obeying the commandments of the Lord.

3d. I may add, that Titus was commanded by Paul to select persons for teachers in the churches, who might be able to resist those false teachers. The connexion between verse 9 and 10, shows this. Among other qualifications, which such persons ought to possess, they were to be men, "holding fast the faithful word as they had been taught." Why? It is added, "that they may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." And what rendered this the more necessary, it is added, "for there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision," etc. By these, and such like ordinary means, were these false teachers to be cured, and made sound in the faith, or turned again to the truth.

I have thus, somewhat minutely, gone over every material thing in this passage. My remarks have extended far beyond my own expect-

ation. In conclusion, indulge me with a few additional observations. 1st. Universalist preachers, in the present day, are looked on by almost all sects, as false teachers, as very dangerous men in society. Let us then look at this passage for a moment, and see whether the character and conduct of the false teachers mentioned in it, agree better with their character and conduct, or with that of their accusers. Are the preachers of Universalism more unruly in their conduct than the preachers in other sects? No honest man will say so. Nor will the court records, throughout the land, be found to contain so many of their suits for bad conduct, as even some of their defamers. Well, are they more in the habit of vain talking than the preachers of other sects, in their public teaching? We should think not, for Universalist preachers make a constant appeal to the bible for the truth of their opinions. When do you hear them passing off upon their hearers bold assertions for truth? or, collecting a mass of silly stories and anecdotes to amuse, or produce effect on their audiences, to make converts to their sect? Never. But is not this very common, with the preachers who deem them false teachers, and some of these very stories are told by preachers to give their slander effect. But again, are Universalist preachers deceivers? How? In what way do they deceive? It cannot be in their preaching, for what they have to say, they proclaim on the house top, and appeal to scripture and argument for the truth of their views. What class of men can be named, who are more open, frank, and honest in their teaching than they are? They have no secret meetings with their converts to tell them things which it would be improper to tell all the world, if assembled. They would blush to adopt means to make converts, which are unblushingly adopted by those who defame them. Again, I ask, whether are Universalist preachers or their accusers most in the habit of creeping into houses, and overturning whole families, to gain converts, and teaching things which they ought not, yea which they durst not, if the head of the family was at home? Say, which of the two produce the most disturbance in families, with their visits, tracts, and endless routine of meetings? I do not ask which of the two gives the most evidence, that their object is filthy lucre, for all will allow that money, money, is the constant cry of Universalist's accusers. They never say they have enough. They are as rapacious as wild beasts, for neither the widow nor the fatherless can find a way to escape from them. And as to pampering the belly, surely our accusers do not look as if they confined themselves to the bare promise of God, bread and water.

But there is one thing which deserves to be more particularly noticed. Do Universalist preachers tell more lies than their accusers? Are they, like the Cretians, "always liars?" Which of the two tell the most stories about revivals, and conversions at a distance, to get up a revival in some other place? Which of them finds the least compunction of conscience in telling lies for the glory of God, and think the end will justify the means? Say, which of the two devise plans of piety and benevolence, declaring them free of all sectarian views, yet in the end are sure to turn them to this account? If in these and other things, Universalists are indeed the most guilty, let them be condemned, for their condemnation is just. But of this let the public, yea, let our accusers judge.

2. Whoever teaches things which he ought not, or to whomsoever the character and conduct mentioned in this passage apply, let him belong to what sect he may, he ought to be sharply rebuked, that he may be sound in the faith. Such teaching, condemned by Paul in his day, is not uncommon in ours. How much vain talking, in the way of anecdote, stories,

and false glosses on the scriptures, are retailed, night after night, may be learned from a few visits to religious meetings. If the hearers had only courage and independence enough to ask, are these things true, the spell would be dissolved, and the teachers would listen to the inquiry as to the knell of death. They would immediately perceive that the craft was in danger, for inquiry always leads to the detection of error and the discovery of truth.

But to rebuke some teachers sharply in our day, does not seem to answer the purpose; and the false teachers in Paul's day, were harmless compared with them. The *unruly, vain talkers and deceivers* of whom he speaks, who taught "*things which they ought not,*" drove none to insanity or suicide by their teaching. But now, you can hardly look into a public journal, without seeing new cases of both these, produced by the teaching at religious, or four days' meetings. Instead of rebuking such teachers sharply, the civil authority ought to interfere and put an end to their proceedings, for thus trifling with the lives and happiness of the community. Were a Dr. of physic, in the habit of giving to his patients such large portions of laudanum, that it produced insanity or drove them to suicide, in as great numbers as are driven to these by orthodox preaching, he would be arraigned before the grand jury, and punished for his conduct. Why then suffer such Drs. of divinity to escape? for does it materially alter the case, that a man is not killed with arsenic or laudanum, but only with a strong doze of orthodox fanaticism. I am aware, that such men may say—we have no intention to produce insanity or drive people to suicide by our preaching; on the contrary we mean to *save their immortal souls*, and cure them of their vices. Granted, but so might the Dr. of Physic plead before the grand jury, that he meant to cure not kill his patients. But would, ought this to be received as an excuse for the evil he had done, and especially, when he had seen so many cases of insanity and death occasioned by his mal-practice. Why then excuse such religious teachers, and allow them to persist in a course of false teaching, which is clearly proved to be so, by the horrible effects produced by it on the community. Did Jesus Christ or his apostles, ever drive a single individual to insanity or suicide by their preaching? No man will say so; and it is conclusive evidence that such orthodox preaching cannot be according to the scriptures. We are astonished beyond measure, that sensible men among the orthodox are not alarmed at this fact, and abandon a system which is productive of such direful consequences. What would such men not say, what would they not do, did the preaching of Universalists produce similar effects? all sects, the whole population would be roused against them, bills of indictment would be found against them for murder or manslaughter, and no other argument would be necessary to prove their doctrine false, than, simply pointing to the effects it had produced. To rebuke them sharply would be deemed far too slight a punishment for the offences they had committed. And are we indeed come to this, in a free country, where we are governed by just laws, that to kill a man with *Calvinism* is no crime, but he that kills him with *Universalism*, forfeits his liberty if not his life. Orthodox people, open your eyes and look around you, at the multitude of persons driven to insanity and suicide by your doctrines, and demand of your teachers to account for the fact, why no such effects were produced by the religion of Jesus Christ in the days of the apostles. Insist on it, that this fact be either rationally and scripturally accounted for, or that you will abandon a system and the men who support it, which is so palpably unscriptural and deleterious in its effects. I shall only add,

3rd. The root from which false teaching in

Paul's day grew, was the love of "*filthy lucre.*" The false teachers, taught "things which they ought not, for *filthy lucre's sake.*" And what distinguished in part the true teachers from them was, they were "*not greedy of filthy lucre.*" They did not teach for hire or divine for reward. Preaching or teaching with them, was not resorted to for an easy life, or to make a living by it. But now it is as much a trade as shoe making or shop keeping; and there is fully as much rivalry among the different sects, who shall build the most splendid meeting houses and draw the most hearers, as there is who shall have the most splendid shops and secure most customers. Nor, is a salesman in a shop deemed of more importance, when he has the faculty to please the customers, pass off the goods to advantage, and draw more, than the preacher is, who can so please the hearers, that all the pews are let or sold and the house crowded. Of such a preacher it is generally said—he is an *excellent man for building up a society*; but when a little more *filthy lucre* removes him to a better station, it falls to pieces like a rope of sand, unless some similar genius, allured also by *filthy lucre*, is procured to keep it together. Love to each other for the truth's sake, is not the bond which binds such societies together, but their minister. He, not Jesus Christ, is their Lord and Master; he, not God, is the object of their love and praise. Honest, faithful, scriptural preachers, are unwelcome in such societies, and some leave the pews when such men make their appearance. Their man-god minister, is not to preach, and why should they attempt to worship.

If in these remarks I have stated an evil, I have touched on one nearly universal among all sects. The question ought to be, how is it to be corrected? Corrected it ought to be, for while it exists, christianity must be disgraced by it, and men who reflect, will suspect, that the christian religion like others, is only an invention of priests for *filthy lucre's sake*. The road to its correction is plain, let all return to the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, and become followers of the first teachers of Christianity. So long as people think, that Christianity is a thing more for public show than practical personal good; and that it can be learned sooner and better from preachers than the scriptures, the evil never will be corrected. Only preserve men in the firm belief, that the salvation of their immortal souls depends on meeting houses and ministers, and you are sure of their money to build the one and pay the other. And while human nature continues as it is, there will always be plenty of men to become ministers "that they may eat a piece of bread." Grievous wolves will not only enter in, not sparing the flock, but men will arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. While the honest, faithful teacher is pining in want, or ministering with his own hands to his necessities, other teachers will be found rioting in every superfluity, "*teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake.*" The people love to have it so, for they will pay, and pamper, and praise, even those who consign them to endless hell torments, without much feeling or ceremony.

PORTRAIT OF DR. ELY.

By GRENVILLE MELLEN.

The next day being Sunday, I found my way to the church of Dr. Ely. As he is a man of some notoriety, I was desirous of hearing him. In this I was amply satisfied. When I entered he was at prayer. I saw a man of about 45, with large curled whiskers, and an air far too genteel for the pulpit—and with infinite *sang froid* withal, addressing the Supreme Being in a style so colloquial that I could hardly trust to my ears. The whole affair seemed to me rather a demand, as a matter of course, than a petition, as a matter of

duty. He was rapid—disconnected—common place—and totally free from all solemnity. No heart could be bowed before such a prayer. It seemed to me that no one of the points which the Dr. urged, in his discourse, could reach the hearts of his hearers, because it was impossible for a single one to reach their understanding first. I never yet found that the preacher could explain any of those abstruse portions of doctrine, on which he will amplify for the hour together, and an unqualified belief in which he vehemently urges upon his audience, as essential to save them from perdition. Dr. Ely, though undoubtedly a man of talent and power, in his way, is no exception to this remark. His attempted illustrations were either vulgar or obscure; and I must confess I was grieved as well as disappointed to see so little made of the great practical truth which formed his text, where there was an opportunity to make so much. The style of his preaching, I cannot designate but by the word *slang-whang-ing*. It is off-hand, familiar, often coarse in the extreme, and with no pretensions to eloquence, rightly so called. He was upon the subject of the comparative vanity of worldly possessions; and took occasion to introduce Stephen Girard's name, 'who,' said he in a parenthesis, 'is the richest man I know of to illustrate my argument.' In another place he was making some supposition concerning the spiritual state of his grand children—'should I ever have any,' said he—'which I hope to God I may have.' His hope was, I think, that they might be pious—a good hope—but how shockingly expressed! The phrase underscored, every body knows, is familiar to the lips of the profane—and one of the commonest ejaculations of the streets. However, the discourse was extemporaneous, and may have been no specimen of the doctor's written sermons, and a bad one of his colloquial. 'After meeting' I was introduced. His manner is pleasing and gentlemanly. During the few moments that I stood by him, I presume twenty females, and females only, approached him—shook his ready hand—made some low inquiry, and deposited in his palm a bank note or half dollar to meet the forenoon's beggary of some sectarian preacher from the far west. This was intolerable. The church is said to be poor—and every thing about it, and the congregation, tell you that it is so—or at least that it is made up of the middling and poorer—though respectable classes of people. Many of these very women looked as though they needed that very money to purchase food for their families—and yet here was a practicing upon their kinder sympathies by men, if they be men, who ought to beg in higher places.

I was satisfied, from what I saw, that here was mistaken zeal on one side, and a want of christian consideration, to use the softest term, on the other; for the Dr. frequently pocketed the money without saying a word to the aged and poor female that dropped it, like the widow of old, into his hand. To give is well. I applaud it. But to give so—to draw from such sources for such an object has my hearty reprobation. I was amused with the music in this church. There is no organ, and the tune is pitched by a chorister who sits directly under the desk, in the old deacon's seat, and who, on this occasion, with an accompaniment of most villainous faces, bore the psalm through at the top of his voice. The congregation joined; but such harsh and unwelcome strains I never desire to hear again. The leader's voice was well enough, but he was for giving us too much of it; and his blowing his head off, to do it, was undignified for the place he sat in. On the whole, it was distracting; and to 'ears polite,' aboriginal, to a degree.

That man is poor, who covets more, and yet wants a heart to enjoy what he has already.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Messrs. Editors—The following extracts are from the pen of a Presbyterian Clergyman who lived in this city, some twelve or fourteen years ago. He was a scholar and a christian, and his memory will ever be dear to those who knew him; but the following will show the fact, that some ministers, celebrated for learning and piety, write different sentiments from those they preach, and secretly entertain opinions that they are unwilling to make public. B. B. H.

New-York, February 17th, 1832.

In writing of "the strain of preaching continually and incessantly used, in many of the pulpits of this city," he says, "It comes in thunders and anathemas from their desks, in cants, whispers, and inuendoes, among the throng: it comes larded with much *holy grimace*, and many *sanctimonious sighs*, for the credulous and pious; with much logical jargon, and biblical criticism for smatterers: with spleen and gall enough when the company has sufficient pride, and malice to bear it; and with firebrands for all the young foxes they can catch. When they have exhausted their topics of argument, and that they can soon do, without a miracle, they resort to sarcasm and ridicule, and here their talents are wonderful: Hercules often comes in 'head and shoulders.'"

In speaking of original sin, he says, "It has descended from the lumber and trash of the dark time of ignorance and superstition, mysticism and bigotry. Yet you shall hear it inculcated from Sabbath to Sabbath in many of our churches, and swallowed down as a sweet morsel, by many a gaping mouth, that a man ought to feel himself actually guilty of a sin committed six thousand years before he was born, nay, that he ought to feel himself deserving of eternal damnation for the first sin of Adam. The atrocity of this doctrine is beyond comparison. No such doctrine is taught in the scriptures, or can impose itself on any rational mind, which is not trammelled by education, dazzled by interest, warped by prejudice, and bewildered by theory. This doctrine perpetually urged and the subsequent strain of teaching usually attached to it, will not fail to drive the incautious mind to secret and practical, or open infidelity. Is it wonderful that there should be so many Gallios in this city? That so many should, with scornful smile, turn from this monstrous jargon, and cry out 'wretched mysticism! riddles! contradictions! What, was I rendered by Adam's first act of sin a criminal deserving endless torments? Was I at the same time totally incapacitated to yield obedience to the Almighty Ruler? Was I bound hand and foot six thousand years ago, and rocks of adamant laid on the seal of my eternal perdition?—Impossible! The glorious volume of nature itself contradicts all this, and shows me a far different character of my Creator and preserver.'"

Of the doctrine of "election and reprobation," he thus writes, "The muddiness, the confusion, the arrogance with which these sentiments are hurled forth in a storm of popular eloquence, or shall I say vociferation, precludes all possibility of conviction. One man sits and hears it with that kind of stupid amazement with which we hear a hail storm rattling upon the roof, and thunder rolling over our heads, till he is stunned into a kind of thoughtless reverie, and gathers as much from it as Cush did from the defeat of Absalom. 'I saw a great tumult my lord, O king, but knew not what it was.' Another hears it with contempt and secret indignation, and as he retires, musing, says to himself, 'are these the boasted principles and doctrines of religion said to be so luminous, so simple, so rational, so intelligible, so convincing?' But these teachers will tell him, for his consolation, 'No wonder you don't understand these truths for they are evangelical truths, and you are a

natural man.' Wretched subterfuge! as wise and as profound as if a man should say to me, that two and two are fifteen, and it is only because you want mathematical skill that you can't perceive it.—Alas! what huge masses of flummery, falsehood, and false doctrines; what immense cargoes of wood, hay and stubble, the lumber and trash of speculation and fanaticism, are vended as evangelical truth, which the *natural man* cannot understand. Were a painter to draw an emblem of their plan, you would see the distorted phiz, squinting eye, and haggard features of perfect selfishness, mounted on the huge, inflated, and putrescent carcass of Antinomianism. If the lapse of years shall not show that the aggregate of people who have steadily heard these doctrines, have become irreligious, profligate and abandoned; if successive generations of youth who shall arise under such moral and intellectual culture, do not grow up progressively ignorant, dissolute and profane, I shall rejoice to have it appear that my forebodings were groundless."

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Messrs. Editors—The following query has frequently presented itself to my mind—Why do christians, who claim to be orthodox, oppose the Universalist, when both professedly labor to establish the same leading or fundamental principles. The sincere orthodox christian desires to promote love to God, benevolence, charity, good will among mankind, and professes belief in the infinite and unchanging goodness of God, the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the consequent resurrection of mankind from the dead, and the necessity of faith and repentance towards God, and a virtuous and holy life. The sincere Universalist dwells with rapture and delight upon the infinite and unchanging goodness of God, for, says he, with the apostle, "God is love"—with the Psalmist, "that he is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works,"—with the Prophet, "that he is the Lord and changes not," and with the Savior, that the first and great commandment is to "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself"—that "Christ has risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept," and that "life and immortality are brought to light through the Gospel"—that unless a man is "born again" or brought from darkness into gospel light, he cannot see, or enjoy the "kingdom of God," and that "without holiness no man can see the Lord." The sincere orthodox christian holds these as sacred truths, and as the fundamentals of true religion, and preaches and prays for their accomplishment, and enforces them with all the zeal in his power. The sincere Universalist, believing in the gospel God preached to Abraham, does the same, believes the same, hopes the same, and prays for the same, with this difference, however, he has a well grounded faith in the *will* and *power* of God to accomplish what he thus believes and prays for. Yet, as this faith and confidence cannot alter first principles, I am still compelled to ask, Why do the orthodox condemn the Universalist for inculcating and enforcing truth upon the mind, which they (the orthodox,) believe, or acknowledge to be, the fundamental principles of Christianity, and sacred precepts of Christ? The only correct answer which I think can be given, is in the language of a Disciple to the Savior. "Master, we saw one casting out Devils in thy name; and forbade him, because he followeth not with US!" But what says the Savior; "FORBID HIM NOT, for he that is not against us is for us."

The Universalist in enforcing his sentiments, does it with the full conviction that the orthodox admit first principles in their faith, the conclusion of which, if duly acknowledged, would lead to the same doctrine and final results, which

he believes in and rejoices to establish. And in opposing Universalists, they oppose, in effect, what they admit to be the doctrine of Christ, and commit the same offence as the disciples did, in forbidding the man who cast out devils, because he followed not with them; thus manifesting they have faith, (as the disciples had), but not according to knowledge.

But, say the orthodox, we believe certain points or doctrine, respecting the future condition of man, that you do not. Then I would ask, if what they believe and acknowledge as fundamental principles be admitted, the conclusions of which necessarily leading to and establishing what I believe, does it not leave their other certain points or doctrines, if opposed to these first principles, without foundation, except in their own imaginations, or nothing more than a mere tradition, believed without a "Thus saith the Lord"; and whether in condemning what the Universalist believes, they do not condemn the first principles of their own belief. But the Universalist, in rejecting those certain doctrines, only rejects the belief of what, according to their admissions, cannot exist unless the great first cause is changed, and then the premises must be changed, and both may be in error. Let then the orthodox admit conclusions necessarily flowing from existing truths, or acknowledged principles, and they would see with the Universalist the perfect harmony of the divine attributes with nature and revelation—that they all agree in establishing the same results, founded on the unbounded benevolence of God, his paternal character and government of the human race—ordering all things, doing all things for the greatest possible good of the whole, in time and eternity, which can be no less than the perfect holiness and happiness of all mankind.

N. S. R.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"EVANGELICAL" PRIDE.

Messrs. Editors—I was conversing some time since, with a member of a certain Presbyterian Church, on the subject of preaching, &c. when I remarked that a doctor of divinity (whom I named,) received annually too exorbitant a sum for his services; that if it was true, as the doctor declared, "that every dollar may be the means of saving a soul," he ought to take from his parochial charge just enough to feed and clothe himself comfortably, not "sumptuously," and let them send the rest to "the valley of the Mississippi," or to some heathen land. He replied, "Why Doctor —'s congregation is very large, and they are rich, they are too proud to have a pastor who would preach for a less sum than they pay him, they would not employ a minister who would be satisfied with a smaller compensation." Alas, thought I, is this the religion of him who "had not where to lay his head"—who went about preaching and doing good and who sent his apostles without "silver and scrip" to preach his gospel? Is this the religion of Paul, who labored "with his own hands, that he might not be chargeable?" I do not reprehend preaching, and "those who preach the gospel should live of the gospel." But it is in my humble opinion widely departing from the spirit of true christianity to render a clergyman "quickly rich" by "the golden stream," and for a congregation of the professed followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, of any sect, thus to pamper their "pride." Let our ministers receive a fair and reasonable compensation, and let the people of their charge rather "glory in the Lord" than in their ability to pay their teacher two or three thousands a year. Let them learn that "to be great in the kingdom of heaven," consists not in the abundance of the "unrighteous mammon" they possess; "Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

C.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND F. PRICE.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1832.

BOOKS.

We with pleasure mention the receipt of a supply of Br. Pickering's "*Lectures in Defence of Divine Revelation*"—Br. Whittemore's "*Notes on the Parables*," and "*Smith on Divine Government*." We would invite our friends not only to call and examine, but to purchase them.

The Scriptural Exposition from the practiced pen of Br. Balfour will, we doubt not, be read by all with interest and to profit. It is an explanation of the passage that cannot but be satisfactory to every mind. We do not agree with the writer in all the remarks which follow the exposition, and on one point we feel it a duty to avow our dissent. We deprecate as sincerely as any one the unhappy effects consequent upon popular revival preaching, but we cannot believe that the case demands an interposition of the strong arm of the law. Such an interference would certainly prove a dangerous precedent. Besides, the logic of courts and prisons, at least in matters of religion or conscience, is, as all history testifies, the poorest logic in the world; and Universalists should be the last to wish it called to their aid. There is a power in our country stronger than a thousand legislative enactments on this subject. Popular opinion will effectually do the work that bailiffs and chains could never effect, and we are much mistaken if the time is not coming, when revivalists will rue the day that first saw their late extraordinary measures to make proselytes. The violent measures they have adopted, the earnest manner in which they have inculcated the awful doctrines of inexhaustible wrath and an endless hell, have, while they drove some to despair and suicide, opened the eyes of thousands to the real tendency of such measures and the natural, we had almost said infallible consequences of such doctrines. And aside from private suffering, the horrors of despair and the pangs of broken hearts, we must rejoice in the wide spread and fanatical excitements that have prevailed the past year. Good we are confident will come from so much evil. Like the Salem Witchcraft the very excesses will tend to explode the error by which they were generated. S.

PROTRACTED MEETINGS.

Notwithstanding these singular inventions have now lost their novelty, and consequently much of their effect, they are still continued with unabated zeal. The late complaints of the Evangelist on the subject are abundant proof, however, that the success of their recent efforts is by no means satisfactory. The fourteen days' meeting in Mr. Patton's Church produced but few conversions. The later protracted meetings in Dr. Spring's, Dr. Ludlow's, and Dr. Woodbridge's, we presume, from the marked silence, or the cautious manner in which mention is made of them, have not realized the expectations of their friends. The truth is, protracted meetings have become uninteresting, and

the concentrated power of the whole body of Presbyterian clergy in this city, can now effect little by their means. Their hearers have listened to the most impassioned addresses, to the most eloquent appeals that hypocrisy or fear could inspire, to the most glowing descriptions of a burning and an endless hell, until they are hardened against every arrow. The excitement has passed away, and with it has gone the wonderful revival. Churches that a twelvemonth since, would have been thronged to suffocation, are now comfortable, not to say badly attended. The congregations too are mostly females, sometimes ten to one, and generally five to one, of the other sex. But even females have lost their peculiar sensibility, and in most cases can view the most high-wrought pictures of hell without emotion. Indeed our Presbyterian friends are destined to realize the truth of the old adage that "too much of one thing is good for nothing."

Br. Leavitt of the Evangelist seems to be of opinion that a variety of methods may be adopted in preaching so as to keep up attention, and produce excitement by novelty. New measures we are fully satisfied are necessary in order to convert sinners. And with all becoming deference to the experience and wisdom of our Presbyterian brethren, we will take the liberty of suggesting an entire new method of preaching which we flatter ourselves would be accompanied with the happiest results.

1. We would suggest that hereafter the gospel, i. e. *good news*, be preached instead of the terrors of HELL, and generally, that efforts be used to *persuade* men rather than to *frighten* and *drive* them.

2. We recommend that our heavenly Father be represented as "*kind to the unthankful and the evil*." This, besides convincing men that God is almost as good as his earthly ministers, will perhaps lead them to experience and say, "we love him because he first loved us." And would it not be well to make a few experiments on that obsolete doctrine of Paul that *the goodness of God leads to repentance*?

3. We would suggest also that men be taught that God is "*a just God, and a Savior*," "who will by no means clear the guilty." This is a point sadly overlooked in the present method, inasmuch that most revival preachers, instead of teaching that God will "reward every man according to his works," have expended their time and talents in attempts to discover some means by which the *guilty* might escape *deserved punishment*. It would be startling no doubt to most hearers, but would it not be advisable to hint now and then that God is "THE SAVIOR OF ALL MEN."

4. But to be short, perhaps it might be well while we are recommending *new measures*, to do it thoroughly, and then we would suggest that hereafter the BIBLE be taken as the directory instead of the "Confession and Catechism." S.

NEW VERSION.

We last week took the opportunity of listening to the first discourse delivered at a protracted meeting held in Rutgers-street Church, which, from one or two circumstances, seems to deserve

notice. The text judiciously selected for the occasion may be found in Joshua iii, 5, which the learned Doctor read thus, interpolating the word marked by italics: "And Joshua said unto all the people, Sanctify yourselves: for to-morrow the Lord will do wonders among you." We do not mention this addition to the sacred text as affecting, in the slightest degree, the sentiment, but as an instance of remarkable carelessness on the part of the preacher. That it was not a mere slip of the tongue, seemed evident from its repetition. The little word ALL is sometimes important, and if in one place it may be so unceremoniously added to the Holy Scriptures, we should fear that in others it might run the hazard of being taken away. In his peroration, however, the learned Doctor surprised us by a new version of Luke xiii, 3, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." We know not by what reasons he was induced to alter our present reading, but so it verily happened, and the passage was quoted and applied to sinners then present as the words of Christ thus: "Except ye repent, ye shall all *surely* perish." We candidly ask the Rev. gentleman for his *authority* thus to misquote the words of our Redeemer; and we will assure him that neither his gray hairs, nor his popularity, nor his abused profession, shall screen him from public exposition, when for the pitiful purpose of *frightening* a few females, he thus tramples on the word of God. The gentleman knows full well that the passage was uttered by our Savior in direct reference to the Jews, and that it was prophetic of the impending destruction of the holy city. No man of ordinary discernment can read it in its connexion without observing this. Even Dr. Scott, if we are not much mistaken, that merest echo of modern theology, acknowledges the passage in question to have been *literally* fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. And yet a passage which was spoken in relation to temporal death, is now to be applied by a Doctor in the church to eternal torments, and unsatisfied with this, he will unblushingly alter the very words of Christ in order to remove the original allusion it contained. S.

"THE ARGUMENT OF UNBELIEVERS."

An article under this head will be found on another page which we copy from the Evangelist, and which we recommend to a careful perusal. We fully appreciate the motives both of the writer and Br. Leavitt in their obvious anxiety to associate Universalists with *infidels* and *atheists*, and willingly grant them all the advantages which such conduct on their part can afford to the cause they advocate. We shall briefly examine the sentiments advanced by the writer of the article in question, which Br. Leavitt regards as so masterly a production.

1. It will be observed that the writer concludes that "the Universalist does not derive his doctrine in the first place from the oracles of God but rather from his attributes." This is a virtual and obvious confession that the *attributes* and *oracles* of God lead to very different results, inasmuch that while the *ATTRIBUTES* of God teach the doctrine of final universal holiness and happiness, the *ORACLES* deny this doctrine and teach

the opposite, viz. endless misery. This consequence cannot be avoided even by the writer himself. Now it is a fact which we challenge any man to dispute that the Universalist goes to the oracles to learn the attributes of God. He is there taught that God is love, that he is good unto all and that his tender mercies are over all his works. He is there taught also that God is Almighty, that he possesses all power, that he does as he pleases, and that none can stay his hand, or say, what dost thou? The infallible conclusion is that if the oracles of God teach a doctrine inconsistent with the attributes they ascribe to the Deity, they contradict themselves. The Universalist meets no difficulty like this, for he believes that the scriptures are consistent, and we leave our writer to free himself from the dilemma in which his weakness has involved him. He acknowledges that the Universalist's argument is sound if his premises be true, and the premises are the goodness and the power of Jehovah. Hence in order to avoid the awful doctrine of universal salvation he must deny one or the other of these divine attributes. Truly the cause of endless sin and suffering must be desperate indeed!

2. We may observe in the second place another virtual acknowledgment on the part of our writer of a fact which Universalists have always insisted upon, viz. that the doctrine of *endless misery drives men to infidelity*. He says that the infidel reasons exactly in the same manner relative to the attributes of God and comes to the same conclusion, "but, then he has discernment enough to see that the scriptures contain the doctrine of future endless punishment. He therefore discards the divine origin of the book, as inculcating a doctrine so obviously false, and inconsistent with the perfections of God." That the infidel has discernment enough to believe that "the scriptures contain the doctrine of future endless punishment," a doctrine that receives more attention from the professed expounders of the word, and is more frequently inculcated by them than any other doctrine in the Bible, we shall not question; but we do most explicitly deny, that either he or any other man can prove that doctrine true. Be this as it may, however, our writer has the candor to confess not only that the Scriptures, according to his creed, teach doctrines repugnant to the almost universally acknowledged attributes of God, but also that this very fact accounts for infidelity in the divine origin of these Scriptures. This is precisely what we have always believed on the subject.

3. The atheistical argument concerns Universalists no farther than it does any other class of Christians. It is based on principles acknowledged by every christian denomination on earth, viz. the *infinite goodness* and the *Almighty power* of God. We know that because evils are seen to exist, atheists deny that there is an omnipotent and benevolent being, in other words a God, in the universe. The Universalist meets this argument by contending that although there is evil, it is only *temporary*, and that its very existence was designed by an all-wise, benevolent, and powerful being, to subserve a good purpose. This view precludes the idea of *eternal sin and suffering*. Without doing this, it is impossible not to arrive at the conclusion of the atheist, that there is no God, or with our writer, deny either the *goodness* or the *power* of God, the former of which is worse, and the latter no better, than atheism itself; for it would be better to have none than a malignant God, and as well none, as a powerless one.

4. Our writer, in order to preserve the glorious doctrine of endless misery inviolate, is compelled to abandon one of the attributes of God! Let not the reader be startled. He says, "if the premises [the power and goodness of God] are admitted to be true, the conclusion follows with

all the force of absolute demonstration. ***

Here then the advocate of truth [endless misery] is bound to show, that there is a fallacy in these premises. Where then does the fallacy lie? The premises rest on two attributes of God, his power and benevolence." The writer proceeds to examine the premises beforementioned, and after rejecting the systems of Calvin and Hopkins, which insist so largely on the divine sovereignty, foreordination of whatsoever comes to pass, &c. he comes to the conclusion that God cannot "exclude sin, and its consequent suffering from a moral system." We would speak reverently on this subject, but really our writer represents the Deity as well-disposed, but absolutely unable to do his own will. The result seems to be that God created a world of intelligent beings whom he had no power to control and who have hitherto been, and forever will be sinning against his wish and pleasure.

The question here arises, why God created such a world and established such a system. Our writer speaks confidently of "that system which infinite goodness demands." Infinite goodness then demanded a moral system which God could never govern, and which he must have known, had he half the foresight of our writer, would exist in eternal rebellion to himself. This we must confess a most singular kind of infinite goodness! We should observe however that if, as our author will have it, the Almighty is indeed as impotent as a child, we shall easily and inevitably arrive at the conclusion, that he possesses neither sufficient knowledge nor benevolence to secure respect or love. It would be worse than folly to speak of the Deity's *foreknowing* events which he had not designed, and which were even entirely dependent on the will of a being, such as man is here represented to be, over whom he had no control and who had "the power to sin in despite of all opposing power." It is unnecessary to say how much influence this simple doctrine would have on the *prophecies* with which the oracles of God are filled. It seems clear however that God cannot foretell what he does not foreknow, and that he cannot foreknow the conduct of beings independent of himself. And it cannot be a question of difficult solution, how much benevolence there was in the act of creating intelligences who should run such imminent risk, and whom the power of God himself could not prevent from suffering endless torments. We should certainly think *wisdom* and *goodness* far less than *infinite* would have hesitated before demanding the creation of such "free agents," and the establishment of such "a moral system."

It may not be improper to say a word to Br. Leavitt to whom we are indebted for this wonderful refutation of "the argument of unbelievers." "We have never seen," says this discerning theologian in raptures, "we have never seen this subject so luminously exhibited, or the fallacy so exactly pointed out without surrendering a particle of the orthodox doctrine." We know not how much regard Br. Leavitt has for the truth, but we do know that this declaration approximates sadly to a palpable falsehood. The Presbyterian "Confession of Faith," which was formerly thought orthodox, says, "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." Again, the same says of God, he "hath most sovereign dominion over them [his creatures] to do by them, for them, and upon them whatsoever himself pleaseth." Indeed Br. Leavitt must have a novel kind of "orthodox doctrine," a *particle* of which is not surrendered by denying the sovereignty of God and his *almighty power*, and we challenge him to find a single denomination of christians in the United States who admit the absurd and atheistical sentiment. S.

RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

The first No. of the *Eleventh* volume of this work made its appearance on Saturday last, under the editorial management of Br. L. F. W. ANDREWS. Its appearance and matter are creditable both to the Publisher and Editor. We heartily wish them success. It will be recollected Br. Andrews but recently embraced his present views. We make the following extract in reference to it, from his introductory remarks.

P.
"Our attachment to the cause in which we are now engaged is deep and ardent. Until within a short period, we were emphatically of that class 'who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime, subject to bondage,' but thanks to a kind Providence, the fetters which bound us for years to the car of a merciless system have been broken, and we have 'tasted and seen that the Lord is good.' The mental slavery under which we have so long labored, has endeared to us the 'glorious liberty,' we now enjoy, and prompts us to an enthusiasm of wishes and efforts for the emancipation of the whole world from the grievous subjection which the 'creeds and commandments of men' have imposed upon it. To this work we now devote whatever of talent we possess, and humbly trust that the editorial 'mantle' which has just fallen from the shoulders of the venerable 'Elijah,' who has for several years occupied this station with so much honor to himself, and advantage to the cause of truth in this region, will descend upon us with a good portion of his 'spirit' and wisdom."

TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

We have just received a supply of the above Pamphlet. Our readers can judge in some measure of its merits by the extracts we have occasionally given from it. It was published by Br. THOMAS of Philadelphia, under the direction of the Philadelphia and New York association, and is a valuable Pamphlet for distribution. Our friends are invited to call and examine them. They will be furnished at cost of Paper and Printing for gratuitous distribution.

FROM THE NEW-YORK EVANGELIST.

THE ARGUMENT OF UNBELIEVERS.

Besides all the evil tendencies of a wicked heart, there can be no doubt that erroneous theological and philosophical theories have been a fruitful source of speculative unbelief. It must be confessed that some of the arguments of unbelievers are conceived with great subtlety and skill, and that many theologians have been unable satisfactorily to confute them, without a virtual departure from some of their own avowed principles. The speculations of theologians about the introduction and continuance of moral evil in the world, have led them to advance propositions, which, if followed out, end in universal uncertainty. We have never seen this subject so luminously exhibited, and the fallacy of the infidel argument so exactly pointed out without surrendering a particle of orthodox doctrine, as in the last number of the Christian Spectator. It is in a note to the able and unanswerable review of Dr. Fisk's sermon on predestination. The elegantly engraved "card" spoken of, which contained the sum of all infidel argument in half a dozen lines, was given by an avowed sceptic in this city to a gentleman now employed as a tract agent in Indiana.

"It may be useful to turn our attention for a moment to the nature of the reasoning here alluded to. The Universalist does not, (if we rightly judge) derive his doctrine in the first place from the oracles of God, but rather from the attributes of God; and then labors to interpret the scriptures in accordance with his doctrine. The argument on which he relies as the real basis of his faith is the following. God, as

infinitely benevolent, must be disposed to prevent sin with all its evils. God, as omnipotent, can prevent sin in all his moral creatures; God therefore will hereafter prevent all sin; and thus render all his creatures happy forever.

The infidel reasons exactly in the same manner, and comes to the same conclusion. But, then, he has discernment enough to see that the scriptures contain the doctrine of future endless punishment. He, therefore, discards the divine origin of the book, as inculcating a doctrine so obviously false, and inconsistent with the perfections of God.

As a specimen of atheistical reasoning on this subject, a friend has put into our hands a card engraved in an attractive style, and said to have been printed in New-York, and extensively circulated, by a club of atheists in that city. It contains the following words: "God either wills, that evil should exist, or he does not. If he wills the existence of evil, where is his goodness? If evil exists against his will, how can he be ALL POWERFUL? And if God is both good and omnipotent, where is evil? Who can answer this?"

Now it is manifest, that the several conclusions of the Universalist, the infidel, and the atheist, are all derived from substantially the same premises. If the premises are admitted to be true, the conclusion follows with all the force of absolute demonstration. The premises are briefly, that the permanent existence of evil is inconsistent with the goodness and the power of God. Hence the atheist infers, in view of existing evil and the want of evidence that it will ever end, that there is no omnipotent, benevolent being—there is no God. The Universalist and the infidel maintain the eternal existence of evil to be inconsistent with the perfections of God, and hence infer, that ultimately all evil will be excluded from the system; the one explaining away the plainest declarations of the bible, and the other denying the divine origin of the book.

Here then the advocate of truth is bound to show, that there is a fallacy in these premises. Where then does the fallacy lie? The premises rest on two attributes of God, his power and his benevolence. As to his power, the argument assumes, that God can, by his omnipotence, exclude sin, and its consequent suffering, from a moral system. Those who admit this assumption, have therefore no plea left for the divine benevolence, except to assert, that "sin is the necessary means of the greatest good;" and that for this reason, it is introduced into our system, and will always be continued there, by a being of infinite benevolence. But can this be proved? Is this supposition consistent with the sincerity of God as a law giver, the excellence of his law, the known nature and tendency of sin and holiness, and the unqualified declarations of the divine word, that "sin is the abominable thing which his soul hateth," that he "would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth," &c. Can this be consistent with his actually preferring the existence of all the sin in the system to holiness in its stead? For ourselves, we must say, that we regard the success of any attempts to make men believe this, as utterly and forever hopeless. Our confident anticipation is that Universalism, infidelity and atheism in this land and through the world, will only go on to new triumphs, so long as their overthrow is left to depend on the truth of the position, that God prefers sin to holiness, in any of his moral creatures. We are thrown back then to consider the other branch of this argument, viz. the assumption that God as omnipotent can prevent all moral evil in a moral system. Is not here the fallacy? We know, that a moral system necessarily implies the existence of free agents, with the power to sin in despite of all opposing power. This fact sets human reason at defiance, in every attempt to

prove, that some of these agents will not use that power and actually sin. There is at least a possible contradiction involved in the denial of this: and it is no part of the prerogative of omnipotence to be able to accomplish contradictions. But if it be not inconsistent with the true idea of omnipotence, to suppose that God cannot prevent all sin in a moral system, then neither is it inconsistent with his goodness that he does not prevent it: since sin in respect to his power of prevention, may be incidental to the existence of that system which infinite goodness demands. It is, then, in view of this groundless assumption, concerning omnipotence that we see the reasoning of the Universalist, the infidel and the atheist, to be the merest *paralogism*, or begging of the question. The utter impossibility of proving their main principle, is so obvious that they can be made to see it, and we hope, to acknowledge it. At any rate, until this mode of refutation be adopted, we despair of the subversion of their cause, by reasoning. By that mode of argument which assumes that God prefers sin to holiness, the main pillar of their conclusion, viz. that God can prevent all moral evil in a moral system, is conceded to them, and thus they are only confirmed in their delusions. When shall the defenders of the truth learn the difference between scriptural doctrines and groundless theories? When will they see, that a zeal for the one, leads them to attach truth to the other, and thus inadvertently to prepare the way for the worst of errors?"

DEDICATION.

Agreeable to previous notice, says the last Religious Inquirer, the New Universalist Church at Berlin, Conn. was dedicated "to the service of the living God" on Wednesday last. Although the travelling was bad, and the weather unfavorable, a large and highly attentive audience convened to witness the ceremonies of the occasion. Much praise is due to our brethren in Berlin, for their zeal in the cause of truth, as evinced by the erection of so convenient and beautiful a Temple, wherein to "pay unto God thanksgiving." May the good Shepherd lead this little flock "through green pastures and by the side of still waters." Sermons were delivered by Br. Andrews in the forenoon and by Br. M. H. Smith in the afternoon, and a lecture by Br. Smith in the evening.

INDIANA ASSOCIATION.

At a meeting of Universalists held in the town of Leavenworth, Ind. on the 30th September last, an Association was formed under the name of the "First Association of Universalists of the state of Indiana." The Association adjourned to meet in Rome, Ind. on the first Sunday in October, 1832.

MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

The society of Universalists in the above place, have invited Br. ROBERT SMITH to labor with them three-fourths of the time.

The Inquirer states that a new society of Universalists of about 40 members, was formed in Collinsville, Conn. January 13th.

A new Universalist society was formed in the village of M'Lean, N. Y. on the 10th ult.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

Devoted to the Doctrine of Universal Benevolence, the defence of Liberal Principles, generally, in Religion, and miscellaneous reading, of chaste and moral tendency.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND P. PRICE.

The CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published every Saturday at No. 22 Division-street New-York, on good paper and type, royal quarto form, at \$2

per annum, in advance. Of the merits of the work it will not become the Publisher to speak. Sixteen numbers are already before the public, from which some estimate may be formed of its general course and character. Its primary design is to "plead the cause" of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians, (the Universalists)—to illustrate and enforce their principles, and defend firmly, though as far as possible, with christian candor, their doctrine from the opprobrium which even professing christians endeavor, too readily, to fasten upon it; and in thus defending its own, it will advocate the civil and religious rights of all. Professing a sentiment which recognizes the Almighty as our common Father, and mankind as brethren indeed, it can know no exclusive privileges. Whatever it may ask for itself, it asks for ALL. It is consequently hoped it may be acceptable to many who do not precisely or fully acknowledge its principles. On Universalists, however, the Publisher more immediately relies for support. The importance of a publication of the kind in this city, will not for a moment be questioned by them. In the conduct of the MESSENGER, no exertions will be spared to render it worthy of patronage, and creditable to the cause in which it is engaged.

In connexion with the Paper, it has been desired, if possible, to establish a permanent Book concern, adapted, particularly, to the wants of the Universalist community. This is deemed equally important with the Paper. While almost every other denomination have their exclusive Book Depositories, in addition to a ready access to all their works in the ordinary Bookstores, the Universalist is wholly destitute of the former, and rarely, if ever, can find works treating on his sentiment, on the shelves of the latter, either from direct opposition to the doctrine, or an apprehension that their business will suffer by exposing such books for sale. The circulation of these works has consequently been attended with serious inconvenience, amounting almost to prohibition. To obviate this and other evils—to place within the reach of all, disposed to inform themselves, the means of judging of its principles, will be the object of this establishment. Books, Pamphlets, &c. are constantly receiving. A somewhat extensive supply is already on hand, to which a general assortment of other Books and Stationary will speedily be added.

The Publisher would earnestly entreat every one friendly to the objects of the Paper, both in the city and from the country, to call at the Publishing Office, 22 Division-street, from time to time, as may be convenient, and acquaint themselves with the work, and its circumstances and prospects, and if deemed worthy of patronage, to lend it their efficient support.

P. PRICE, Publisher.

New-York, Feb. 25th, 1832.

NEW BOOKS.

Just Received and for sale at this Office,
A new Edition of *Pickering's Lectures*, with a likeness of the author.—*Notes on the Parables*, by Br. Thomas Whittemore—*Smith on Divine Government*—*St. Paul a Universalist*, a sermon, by Br. Menzies Rayner, Portland, Me.—A sermon by Br. T. F. King, from the text, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—A sermon delivered at the Funeral of Rev. A. V. Bassett by Br. T. Whittemore, with a new supply of 100 Arguments in favor of Universalism, Sermons on the Parable of the Rich man and Lazarus, and Sheep and Goats, &c.

RELIGIOUS NOTICE.

Br. S. J. HILLYER, will preach in Newark, Sunday, March 4th, morning and afternoon, and in Camptown in the evening.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

THE BLASTED FLOWER.

was prostrate, and stript of its delicate hue,
 Its bosom all torn by the shivering blast,
 Yet I said the next sun would its beauty renew,
 And o'er the pale relic fresh loveliness cast
 I flew to the spot when the tempest was o'er,
 But no more 'mid its fellows that blossom might
 wave,
 And the sun I had trusted its bloom to restore,
 But shed its warm rays on the floweret's grave.

'Tis an emblem of life! I exclaimed, as the tear,
 The reflection had summon'd, now fell to the
 ground.

Now oft pale and lifeless, ere age can appear,
 The young, like dead flowers, lie scatter'd around.
 The cheek that is brightest in youth's sunny morn,
 The storm of affliction can strip of its bloom,
 And, alas! to restore it no gladness may dawn,
 Till the innocent bosom is cold in the tomb.

C. M. S.

STANZAS.—BY MOORE.

Go let me weep! there's bliss in tears,
 When he who sheds them, inly feels
 Some lingering stain of early years,
 Effac'd by every drop that steals.
 The fruitless showers of worldly wo
 Fall dark to earth and never rise;
 While tears that from repentance flow,
 In bright exhalation reach the skies.
 Go, let me weep! there's bliss in tears,
 When he who sheds them, inly feels,
 Some lingering stain of early years,
 Effac'd by every drop that steals.

Leave me to sigh o'er hours that flew,
 More idly than the summer's wind,
 And, while they passed, a fragrance threw,
 But left no trace of sweets behind.
 The warmest sigh that pleasure heaves,
 Is cold, is faint, to those that swell
 The heart, where pure repentance grieves
 O'er hours of pleasure lov'd too well!
 Leave me to sigh o'er hours that flew
 More idly than the summer's wind,
 And while they passed, a fragrance threw,
 But left no trace of sweets behind.

FROM THE NEW YORK MIRROR.

RESOLUTION.

The longer I live, the more I am impressed with the deep importance of cultivating this quality. It is greatly overlooked in the usual estimates of a man's character. We speak of his generosity, his courage, his integrity, his manners and attainments; we call him amiable, affectionate, intelligent, but we seldom inquire if he is *resolute*. It is equally overlooked in the received systems of education. We teach children grammar, arithmetic, geography; but it is not often that a schoolmaster watches to strengthen by precept and example the growing weakness by which the young boy yields easily to surrounding circumstances. It is true, we praise the resolution by which an individual carries on a great design, but that is not what I mean. The less obtrusive, but far more valuable peculiarity to which I allude, is that quiet, never sleeping spirit which pervades the whole tenor of some men's existence, and is, in fact, the secret cause of greatness and wealth, and success in whatever they undertake. It is the spell by which ordinary minds pass brilliant and gifted intellects, in the journey of life; by which so insignificant a creature as an ant piles a hill for his dwelling; by which the coral insect raises an island in the ocean. If I were a father, I would strive to implant this habit in my son's character. It is more valuable than gold, and will accomplish more than genius, with half the disappointment and peril. How much I admire it—yet how totally I am destitute of it! I have ardently endeavored to acquire it, but have fail-

ed to gain it, from the very fact, that I had it not. With it I could have grasped any other virtue, and nearly any other advantage. I could have been systematic in my business, and regular in my indulgences. I could have been rich. I could have amassed knowledge, and strengthened all the faculties of my mind. It is the "place to stand on" which Archimedes wanted in order to move the world. No one can be resolute in this way without having been taught early a certain contempt for ease and enjoyment: this I have never learned. There is my weak point—every temptation overcomes me. There are moods in which I feel I could effect great things. I have a Spartan severity of thought, and a singleness of purpose, which, could I but retain it, would lead me any where. Could I but be isolated from the gaieties of life; could I be thrust into a dungeon, or on a solitary island, for a certain period, and with a certain object; could I, in any way, rescue myself entirely from the innumerable influences around me, and become actually the master of my own mind, I would not pass away from the earth an unremembered creature. I would leave a monument; but without resolution this is but an idle reverie. Yes—and I fear it would be no more, even in the dungeon, or the island. My own thoughts would be my enemies. Pleasure comes like a spring sun, and dissolves all my snowy designs. The satisfaction of a present impulse has always been more important to me than the success of a remote plan. Irresolution is a habit which creeps upon its victim with a fatal facility. It is not vicious, but it leads to vice, and many a fine heart has paid the penalty of it at the scaffold. Trifling as it appears in the wavering steps of the young, as they grow older its form changes to that of a hideous monster, who leads them to destruction with their eyes open. The idler, the spendthrift, the epicurean, the drunkard, are among its victims. Perhaps in the latter its effects appear in the most hideous form. He knows that the goblet which he is about to drain, is poison, yet he swallows it. He knows, for the example of thousands have painted it to him in glaring colors, that it will deaden all his faculties—take the strength from his limbs—happiness from his heart—oppress him with foul diseases, and hurry his progress to a dishonored grave; and yet he drains it under a species of dreadful spell, like that by which small creatures are said to approach and leap into the jaws of the loathsome serpent, whose fiendish eyes have fascinated them. How beautiful and manly is that power by which the resolute man passes unmoved through these dangers!

CONFIDENCE IN GOD.

What is it that elevates the mind with an unearthly calmness at the near approach of death? What is it that transforms the last hour of human weakness into a scene of angelic triumph and heavenly joy? It is, in the first place, confidence in the mercy of God. This is the first, the great, the principal source of serenity and composure, when all earthly aid fails us. Without this, all others are useless and unavailing. With it, we need little beside. Did we know nothing of God, save that he is our moral governor, and an impartial judge, well might we tremble to appear before him, clothed with all the follies and weaknesses of earth. What are we, and all our services, what is frail, erring, sinful humanity, that it should stand in the presence of the Infinite purity, and eternal majesty of Heaven! But when we know that *mercy* is the great attribute of Deity—when we are told that "God is love," that "as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth those who fear him"—then we have a ground of hope, of confidence, and trust, which the last enemy of man has not power to remove. This confidence the Universalist possesses, or at least may possess to as

great a degree as any of his fellow Christians. His peculiarities of faith, those in which he differs from others, do not rob the Deity of any of his attributes, or Christianity of any of its promises and principles. He believes in God, and in Jesus Christ, and in a resurrection from the dead. There is no gospel duty which his faith does not prompt him to perform. There is no gospel consolation which his faith is not able to impart. He has opinions upon the subject of Christ's death, and the manner in which that death operates to procure our salvation, different from those held by many other sects, and it is in this respect, particularly, that his faith is thought to be deficient in support and comfort in the hour of death. "He has no sacrifice for sin," it is said, "he has denied the redeeming merits of Jesus Christ, and trusts to his own righteousness and good works for salvation." But it is not so: the Universalist trusts for salvation in the mercy of God, in that faith in Jesus Christ which purifies the heart and regulates the life.

PALESTINE.—RUSSELL.

The hills still stand round about Jerusalem, as they stood in the days of David and of Solomon. The dew falls on Hermon, the cedars grow on Libanus, and Kishon, that ancient river, draws its stream from Tabor as in times of old. The sea of Galilee still presents the same natural accompaniments, the fig-tree springs up by the way-side, the sycamore spreads its branches, and the vines and olives still climb the sides of the mountains. The desolation which covered the cities of the plain is not less striking at the present hour than when Moses with an inspired pen recorded the judgment of God; the swellings of Jordan are not less regular in their rise than when the Hebrews first approached its banks; and he who goes down from Jerusalem to Jericho still incurs the greatest hazard of falling among thieves. There is, in fact, in the scenery and manners of Palestine, a perpetuity that accords well with the everlasting import of its historical records, and which enables us to identify with the utmost readiness the local imagery of every great transaction.

Man was created for a rational, and was designed for an active being.

It is much easier to restrain liberty from running into licentiousness, than power from swelling into tyranny and oppression.

UNIVERSALIST BOOKS
FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Life of John Murray.
 Winchester's Dialogues.
 Petitpierre on Divine Goodness.
 Ancient History of Universalism.
 Modern do. do.
 Ballou on Atonement.
 Do. Notes on the Parables.
 Universalist Expositor, Vol. 1, (bound.)
 Streeter's New Hymn Book, 3d and 4th Editions.
 Catechisms, by Brs. Smith, Balch, Reese, and a Clog-
 gyman in Massachusetts.
 Ballou's Catechism.
 Parable of the Sheep and Goats, by T. Whittemore.
 " Rich Man and Lazarus, by do.
 100 arguments for Universalism, by do.
 Pickering's Lectures, in defence of Revelation.
 120 Reasons for Universalism, by Paul Dean.
 Dissertation on Revivals, by M. Rayner.
 Sunday School Hymn Books.
 Spring's Sermon on Election, with a reply by
 Henry Fitz.
 Non-Personality of the Devil, a Sermon, by
 Henry Fitz.
 Messenger Office, Oct. 29.

All letters and communications relating to this
 paper, must be addressed "P. Price, No. 22 Division
 street, New-York."

Printed by JOHN M. DANFORTH, 53 Fulton-street.